

# Fact Sheet

---

<b>Title</b>	Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Maury Island Lone Star Gravel Mine
<b>Description of proposal and alternatives</b>	<p>Lone Star Northwest has submitted a request to King County to significantly increase mining over current levels at its Maury Island sand and gravel mine, and to barge materials off the site using the existing dock. If approved, up to 193 acres of the 235-acre site would eventually be mined. A 50-foot-wide buffer would be retained around the site perimeter, and a 200-foot-wide buffer would remain along the Puget Sound shoreline. The applicant's proposal, two other mining alternatives, and no action are evaluated:</p> <p><b>Proposed Action</b> – Mining levels would increase to a maximum of approximately 7.5 million tons annually, with most of the material being barged to off-island markets. Barge loading could occur 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Up to four 10,000-ton barges (or a greater number of smaller barges) would be loaded during each 24-hour period.</p> <p>Local market sales of sand and gravel would average 15,000 tons annually, with a maximum of 20 trucks per day needed for hauling.</p> <p>Clearing would be phased; up to 64 acres would be actively mined or reclaimed at any one time. Active mining could occur from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays. A portable crushing/screening plant is expected to be used for 1 to 2 months once every 3 to 4 years. Sand/gravel would be transported from mined areas to barges using a conveyor belt system. Mining would last for 11 to 50 years.</p> <p>Consistent with the DNR requirements, site reclamation would include (1) pre-mining site preparation, (2) slope stabilization and erosion control, including stormwater control and temporary erosion control measures such as hydroseeding and filter fence check dams, (3) final contouring and topsoil placement, and (4) revegetation with grasses, shrubs, and trees.</p> <p>To address public safety concerns regarding arsenic contamination of onsite soils, the applicant is proposing to fully contain contaminated materials within a sealed berm. At full capacity (when mining is complete), the berm would measure up to 30 feet high and 2,100 feet long. The berm would be located on the northern edge of the site, but outside of the 50-foot vegetated buffer, which would be maintained.</p>

Because most topsoils would be unavailable for reclamation, either soils manufactured onsite, or offsite soils, or a combination of these two materials would be used to establish topsoil for reclamation. Onsite topsoils would be prepared using composted and/or mulched organic mater (from cleared vegetation) added to non-contaminated soils and/or sands.

**Alternative 1: Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 1** – Mining levels would increase to a maximum of approximately 5.72 million tons annually, with most of the material being barged to off-island markets. Barge loading could occur 16 hours per weekday and 9 hours on Saturday. Up to two 10,000-ton barges (or a greater number of smaller barges) would be loaded on each weekday, and one on Saturday. Local market sales would be the same as the Proposed Action.

Clearing would be phased in the same manner as the Proposed Action. Active mining could occur from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays. A portable crushing/screening plant would be used as for the Proposed Action. Sand/gravel would be transported from mined areas to barges using a conveyor belt system. Mining would last for 15 to 60 years. Reclamation requirements and activities would be the same as the Proposed Action.

**Alternative 2: Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 2** – Mining levels would increase to a maximum of approximately 3.12 million tons annually, with most of the material being barged to off-island markets. Barge loading could occur 12 hours per day, Monday through Saturday. Up to one 10,000-ton barge (or a greater number of smaller barges) would be loaded on each working day. Local market sales would be the same as the Proposed Action.

Clearing would be phased in the same manner as the Proposed Action. Active mining could occur from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays. A portable crushing/screening plant would be used as for the Proposed Action. Sand/gravel would be transported from mined areas to barges using a conveyor belt system. Mining would last for 30 to 75 years. Reclamation requirements and activities would be the same as the Proposed Action.

**No-Action Alternative** – Mining would continue at the current low levels (approximately 20,000 tons per year maximum). No barging would occur. Mined materials would be trucked to local markets.

Mining would be conducted in slow progression from the center of the site out. Active mining would occur from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturday. A portable crushing/screening plant would be used for about a month every 5 to 10 years. Mining would continue indefinitely. Site reclamation would occur to meet DNR requirements, but at a much slower pace than the Proposed Action.

Under No-Action, a much lower volume of soils would require management due to the low level of mining. The method for addressing contaminated soils would be agreed to between the Department of Ecology/King County and the applicant.

<b>Location of site</b>	Portions of Sections 28 and 29, Township 22N, Range 3E, on the eastern edge of Maury Island next to Vashon Island and along the East Passage in King County, Washington.
<b>Proposal's sponsor</b>	Northwest Aggregates (wholly-owned subsidiary of Lone Star Northwest)
<b>Date of implementation</b>	The applicant would initiate increased levels of mining as soon as possible after the Grading Permit is approved. The exact date when this would occur cannot be predicted because of uncertainties in the permitting process.
<b>Lead agency</b>	King County Department of Development and Environmental Services 900 Oakesdale Avenue SW Renton, WA 98055-1219
<b>Responsible official</b>	Greg Borba, Supervisor, Current Planning Section King County Department of Development and Environmental Services Land Use Services Division 900 Oakesdale Avenue SW Renton, WA 98055-1219  Gordon Thomson, Project Manager King County Department of Development and Environmental Services Land Use Services Division 900 Oakesdale Avenue SW Renton, WA 98055-1219
<b>List of possible permit, approval, and license requirements</b>	Revised Grading Permit (King County) Revised Surface Mining Reclamation Permit (Washington Department of Natural Resources) Notice of Construction Permit (Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency) Periodic Review of Extractive and Processing Operations (King County) Aquatic Lands Lease (Department of Natural Resources) Section 10 (Rivers and Harbors Act) Individual Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) Section 404 (Clean Water Act) Permit (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) Endangered Species Act Compliance (National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) Shorelines Substantial Development Permit (King County)

**Authors and principal contributors to DEIS**

**Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.**

Project Management  
Air Quality  
Terrestrial Plants and Animals  
Marine Habitat  
Noise  
Transportation  
Light, Glare, Aesthetics  
Recreation  
Land and Shoreline Use  
Graphics  
Editing and Document Production

**Terra Associates, Inc.**

Geology/Hydrogeology  
Environmental Health and Safety

**M.R. Stearns Planning and Design**

Assistance with:

Light, Glare, Aesthetics  
Recreation  
Land and Shoreline Use

**Draft EIS issue date**

July 21, 1999

**Date comments due**

September 20, 1999

**Time and place of public meeting**

September 14, 1999  
7 – 9 p.m.

Chautauqua Elementary  
9309 S.W. Cemetery Road  
Vashon Island, WA

**Final EIS issue date**

Fall 1999

**Subsequent environmental review**

If a revised grading permit is approved, King County will periodically review the grading permit and compliance with mitigation and monitoring requirements, as stipulated in the County's decision.

**Location of background information**

King County Department of Development and Environmental Services  
900 Oakesdale Avenue SW  
Renton, WA 98055-1219

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc.  
2820 Northup Way, Suite 100  
Bellevue, WA 98004-1419  
425/822-1077

**Cost of copy to public**

\$ 40.00

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	1
Proposal Objectives .....	1
Purpose and Need .....	2
Summary of Proposal and Alternatives .....	2
Description of the Proposed Action .....	2
Alternative 1- Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 1 .....	4
Alternative 2 - Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 2 .....	4
No-Action Alternative .....	5
Significant Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved .....	6
Phased Review .....	6
Summary of Impacts, Mitigation, and Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	6
<b>Chapter 1   Project Purpose and Background .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1   Introduction .....	1-1
1.1.1   Why a Decision is Needed .....	1-1
1.1.2   The SEPA Process .....	1-1
1.1.3   Who is Preparing this EIS and Making the Decision .....	1-2
1.2   Overview of Applicant's Proposal .....	1-2
1.2.1   Other Permits Required for the Applicant's Proposal .....	1-3
1.2.2   Existing Permits .....	1-3
1.2.3   How Mitigation is Addressed in this EIS .....	1-4
1.3   Existing Site Characteristics .....	1-5
1.3.1   Geology/Mineral Resources .....	1-5
1.3.2   Topography .....	1-5
1.3.3   Vegetation .....	1-6
1.3.4   Land Use Designations and Zoning .....	1-6
1.3.5   Site Access and Utilities .....	1-6
1.4   Past and Current Mining Activity .....	1-6
1.5   Citations .....	1-7

<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Description of the Proposed Action .....	2-1
2.2.1	Scale of Operation .....	2-1
2.2.2	Clearing and Ground Preparation .....	2-3
2.2.3	Facilities and Equipment.....	2-4
2.2.4	Progression of Mining .....	2-8
2.2.5	Containment Procedures for Contaminated Soils .....	2-9
2.2.6	Trucking and Barging .....	2-11
2.2.7	Hours of Operation.....	2-11
2.2.8	Employment .....	2-11
2.2.9	Reclamation .....	2-12
2.3	Alternative 1- Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 1 .....	2-14
2.3.1	Scale of Operation .....	2-15
2.3.2	Clearing and Ground Preparation .....	2-16
2.3.3	Facilities and Equipment.....	2-16
2.3.4	Progression of Mining .....	2-16
2.3.5	Containment Procedures for Contaminated Soils .....	2-16
2.3.6	Trucking and Barging .....	2-16
2.3.7	Hours of Operation.....	2-17
2.3.8	Employment .....	2-17
2.3.9	Reclamation .....	2-17
2.4	Alternative 2 - Reduced Barging Hours, Scenario 2 .....	2-17
2.4.1	Scale of Operation .....	2-18
2.4.2	Clearing and Ground Preparation .....	2-18
2.4.3	Facilities and Equipment.....	2-18
2.4.4	Progression of Mining .....	2-19
2.4.5	Containment Procedures for Contaminated Soils .....	2-19
2.4.6	Trucking and Barging .....	2-19
2.4.7	Hours of Operation.....	2-19
2.4.8	Employment .....	2-19
2.4.9	Reclamation .....	2-19
2.5	No-Action Alternative .....	2-20
2.5.1	No-Action Alternatives under SEPA.....	2-20
2.5.2	Facilities and Operation .....	2-21
2.5.3	Containment Procedures for Contaminated Soils .....	2-22

2.5.4	Trucking and Barging .....	2-22
2.5.5	Reclamation .....	2-22
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Air Quality.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	Primary Issues .....	3-1
3.2	Affected Environment .....	3-1
3.2.1	Regulatory Overview .....	3-1
3.2.2	Existing Air Quality .....	3-2
3.3	Impacts .....	3-3
3.3.1	Would fugitive dust resulting from the project exceed regulatory standards at the property line or at nearby residential locations? .....	3-3
3.4	Mitigation Measures.....	3-8
3.4.1	Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation .....	3-8
3.4.2	Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	3-10
3.4.3	Cumulative Impacts.....	3-10
3.4.4	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	3-11
3.5	Citations.....	3-11
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Geology and Hydrogeology .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	Primary Issues .....	4-1
4.2	Affected Environment .....	4-1
4.2.1	Information Sources .....	4-1
4.2.2	Geology.....	4-3
4.2.3	Surface Water .....	4-6
4.2.4	Groundwater .....	4-6
4.3	Impacts .....	4-11
4.3.1	Would mining as proposed affect recharge of the aquifer system or affect the availability of water to residents on Vashon/Maury Islands?.....	4-11
4.3.2	Would mining affect groundwater quality? .....	4-14
4.3.3	Would the mining activity breach an aquifer or otherwise impact adjacent groundwater wells being used by local residents? .....	4-15
4.4	Mitigation Measures.....	4-16
4.4.1	Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation .....	4-16
4.4.2	Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	4-17
4.5	Cumulative Impacts .....	4-18

4.6	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	4-18
4.7	Citations.....	4-19
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b><i>Terrestrial Plants and Animals</i>.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Primary Issues.....	5-1
5.2	Affected Environment .....	5-2
5.2.1	Threatened, Endangered, and other Sensitive Animal Species .....	5-2
5.2.2	Plant Communities and Habitat.....	5-5
5.3	Impacts.....	5-7
5.3.1	Would the project adversely affect a plant or animal listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act, or any other species listed by the state, tribes, or King County as sensitive? .....	5-7
5.3.2	What would the loss of existing madrone imply in terms of (1) regulations, (2) functional values of madrone forest on the site, and (3) regional distribution of madrone?.....	5-10
5.3.3	Over the life of the mine, what is the overall effect on habitat of reactivating high-production mining on the site? .....	5-12
5.4	Mitigation Measures.....	5-15
5.4.1	Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	5-15
5.4.2	Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	5-16
5.5	Cumulative Impacts .....	5-18
5.6	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	5-19
5.7	Citations.....	5-19
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b><i>Marine Habitat and Fisheries</i> .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Primary Issues.....	6-1
6.2	Affected Environment .....	6-1
6.2.1	Physical Components .....	6-2
6.2.2	Biological Components .....	6-3
6.2.3	Other Considerations of the Marine Environment .....	6-6
6.3	Impacts.....	6-6
6.3.1	Would shading from barges at the dock adversely affect eelgrass or other marine biological communities?.....	6-6
6.3.2	Would accidental spillage of sand and gravel during barge loading adversely affect marine life under or near the dock and barges?.....	6-8
6.3.3	What would be the potential for petroleum spills from increased marine equipment activity? .....	6-9



6.3.4	Would an increase in turbidity and deposition of fine sediment from mining and barge traffic propeller wash affect marine organisms? .....	6-10
6.3.5	Would removing a portion of the bluff during mining change the deposition/erosion dynamics of the beach? .....	6-11
6.3.6	What effect would the project have on geoduck clam harvest by the Puyallup Tribe? .....	6-12
6.3.7	Would the noise and vibration from pile driving or barge loading affect salmon and other marine animals, including whales? .....	6-13
6.3.8	Would dock repairs alter salmon habitat or other marine habitats? ....	6-16
6.4	Mitigation Measures.....	6-17
6.4.1	Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	6-17
6.4.2	Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	6-18
6.5	Cumulative Impacts .....	6-19
6.6	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	6-19
6.7	Citations.....	6-19
6.7.1	Printed References .....	6-19
6.7.2	Personal Communications .....	6-21
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Noise .....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
7.1	Primary Issues .....	7-1
7.2	Affected Environment .....	7-1
7.2.1	Background Information on Noise .....	7-1
7.2.2	Regulatory Overview .....	7-4
7.2.3	Existing Sound Levels.....	7-5
7.3	Impacts .....	7-5
7.3.1	Would noise levels resulting from the project exceed regulatory standards at nearby residences? .....	7-5
7.4	Mitigation Measures.....	7-9
7.4.1	Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	7-9
7.4.2	Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	7-9
7.5	Cumulative Impacts .....	7-10
7.6	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	7-10
7.7	Citations.....	7-11

<b>Chapter 8    <i>Transportation</i></b>	<b>8-1</b>
8.1    Primary Issues	8-1
8.2    Truck Traffic	8-1
8.2.1    Affected Environment	8-1
8.2.2    Impacts	8-2
8.2.3    Mitigation Measures	8-3
8.2.4    Cumulative Impacts	8-4
8.2.5    Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	8-4
8.3    Marine Traffic	8-4
8.3.1    Affected Environment	8-4
8.3.2    Impacts	8-9
8.3.3    Mitigation Measures	8-12
8.3.4    Cumulative Impacts	8-13
8.3.5    Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	8-14
8.4    Citations	8-14
8.4.1    Printed References	8-14
8.4.2    Personal Communications	8-14
<b>Chapter 9    <i>Land and Shoreline Use</i></b>	<b>9-1</b>
9.1    Primary Issues	9-1
9.2    Affected Environment	9-1
9.2.1    Current Land Uses	9-1
9.2.2    Growth Management Act, King County Comprehensive Plan, and Vashon Community Plan	9-2
9.2.3    King County Zoning Code (Title 21A)	9-5
9.2.4    King County Grading Permit	9-11
9.2.5    Washington State Surface Mining Act (RCW Chapter 78.44)	9-11
9.2.6    Washington State Shoreline Management Act	9-11
9.2.7    King County Shoreline Master Program	9-12
9.2.8    Washington State Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Lands Lease	9-13
9.3    Impacts	9-14
9.3.1    Is the applicant's proposal consistent with applicable land use policies and regulations?	9-14
9.3.2    What land use changes would occur directly or indirectly, to the project site and adjacent lands, as a result of the proposal?	9-16

9.4 Mitigation Measures.....	9-17
9.4.1 Measures Required or Already Proposed by the Applicant.....	9-17
9.4.2 Additional Suggested Measures .....	9-19
9.5 Cumulative Impacts .....	9-19
9.6 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	9-20
9.7 Citations.....	9-20
9.7.1 Printed References .....	9-20
9.7.2 Personal Communications .....	9-20
<b>Chapter 10 Environmental Health and Safety .....</b>	<b>10-1</b>
10.1 Primary Issues .....	10-1
10.2 Affected Environment .....	10-1
10.2.1 Background.....	10-1
10.2.2 Existing Contaminant Distribution .....	10-2
10.3 Impacts .....	10-4
10.3.1 Would mining remobilize the existing arsenic in the site topsoils as air contamination and dust? .....	10-4
10.3.2 Would mining remobilize the existing arsenic in the site topsoils as surface water contamination? .....	10-5
10.3.3 Would the arsenic be present in soils to be sold and exported from the site? .....	10-6
10.3.4 Would arsenic enter groundwater as a result of the proposal? .....	10-7
10.3.5 Would tug propeller wash stir up contaminated sediments and harm endangered fish species or other marine life? .....	10-8
10.4 Mitigation Measures.....	10-9
10.4.1 Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	10-9
10.4.2 Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts ...	10-13
10.5 Cumulative Impacts .....	10-13
10.6 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	10-13
10.7 Citations.....	10-13
10.7.1 Printed References .....	10-13
10.7.2 Personal Communications .....	10-15
<b>Chapter 11 Light, Glare, and Aesthetics.....</b>	<b>11-1</b>
11.1 Primary Issues .....	11-1
11.2 Affected Environment .....	11-1

11.3 Impacts .....	11-3
11.3.1 What aesthetic changes would occur in the character of the existing landscape on the mine site? .....	11-3
11.3.2 How would the reintroduction of barging affect the visual environment? .....	11-7
11.4 Mitigation Measures.....	11-9
11.4.1 Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	11-9
11.4.2 Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	11-9
11.4.3 Cumulative Impacts.....	11-10
11.4.4 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts .....	11-10
<b>Chapter 12 Recreation.....</b>	<b>12-1</b>
12.1 Primary Issues .....	12-1
12.2 Affected Environment .....	12-1
12.2.1 Existing Recreational Facilities in the Vicinity .....	12-1
12.2.2 Informal Recreational Use of the Project Site .....	12-2
12.3 Impacts .....	12-3
12.3.1 Would the project interfere with the public use and enjoyment of any formal or informal recreational sites in the area?.....	12-3
12.4 Mitigation Measures.....	12-5
12.4.1 Measures Already Proposed by the Applicant or Required by Regulation.....	12-5
12.4.2 Additional Measures for Consideration to Further Reduce Impacts .....	12-5
12.5 Cumulative Impacts .....	12-6
12.6 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	12-6
<b>List of Acronyms .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Distribution List.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Federal Agencies .....	1
Tribal Entities .....	1
State of Washington.....	1
Regional Agencies .....	1
King County .....	1
Local Jurisdictions.....	2
Public Review Locations .....	2
Newspapers .....	2

***Appendix A. Geology and Groundwater Report by Terra Associates, Inc.***

***Appendix B. Environmental Soil Sampling Memorandum by Terra Associates, Inc.***

***Appendix C. Mitigation Report for Contaminated Soils***

***Appendix D. 2nd Addendum for 1998 Amendments to Comp Plan***

***Appendix E. Ground Water Monitoring Results by Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.***

This page left blank intentionally

# List of Tables and Figures

---

***Note to Readers: Tables and figures are located at the end of each chapter.***

## Table

S-1	Comparison of Alternatives Features, Maury Island Mining Operations
S-2	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Air Quality
S-3	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Geology/Hydrogeology
S-4	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Terrestrial Plants and Animals
S-5	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Marine Habitats and Fisheries
S-6	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Noise
S-7	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Transportation
S-8	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Land and Shoreline Use
S-9	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Environmental Health and Safety
S-10	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Light, Glare, and Aesthetics
S-11	Summary of Significant Impacts, Mitigation, and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Recreation
2-1	Comparison of Alternatives Features, Maury Island Mining Operations
3-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards
3-2	Production Rates Used for Emission Calculations
3-3	Peak Year PM <sub>10</sub> Emission Rates Used to Model Potential Impacts
3-4	Maximum Modeled PM <sub>10</sub> Concentrations
5-1	Summary of Vegetative Communities and Associated Wildlife on the Lone Star Maury Island Property

6-1	Summary of Marine Habitat Zones Adjacent to the Project Site
6-2	Compliance Analysis of Washington Administrative Code Guidelines Related to Dock Construction
7-1	Weighted Sound Levels and Human Response
7-2	King County Environmental Noise Limits
7-3	Existing Sound Levels
7-4	Typical Construction Equipment Sound Levels
7-5	Summary of Source Sound Levels
7-6	Operational Sound Levels—Calm Conditions
7-7	Operational Sound Levels—with 2 m/s Wind
8-1	Summary of Roads in the Vicinity of the Project Site
10-1	Analytical Test Results for Surface Soil Samples on the Lone Star Site
10-2	Analytical Test Results for Sand and Gravel Samples on Lone Star Site

## Figure

1-1	Vicinity Map of Southern Puget Sound
1-2	Aerial Infrared Photograph of Maury Island and Vicinity
1-3	Vicinity Map of Maury Island
1-4	Closeup Aerial Infrared Photograph of Project Site and Vicinity
1-5	Existing Site Conditions
2-1	Mining Phasing Plan
2-2A	Final Site Contours Part 1
2-2B	Final Site Contours Part 2
2-3	Reclamation Plan
3-1	Air Quality Modeling Scenarios
4-1	Groundwater Contours
5-1	Madrone Woodlands
5-2	Mixed Madrone/Douglas Fir Woodlands



5-3	Mixed Grasses/Invasive Shrubs and Open Ground
5-4	Red Alder and Willow Thickets
6-1	Cross Section of Nearshore Area Potentially Affected by Proposal
6-2	Marine Habitat Reconnaissance Survey Map
7-1	Sound Level Measurement and Receptor Locations
8-1	Background Turning Movement Volumes, PM Peak Hour, Year 2002
8-2	Washington State Ferry System Routes on Puget Sound
9-1	Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations
9-2	King County Zoning
10-1	Locations of Surface Soil Samples
10-2	Locations of Subsurface Resource Samples
10-3	Proposed Consolidated Cell Locations
10-4	Section 1-1 of Proposed Consolidated Cell
10-5	Profile 2-2 of Proposed Consolidated Cell
11-1	Aerial Photograph of Lone Star Northwest's Maury Island Site
11-2	Aerial Photograph of Lone Star Northwest's Maury Island Site Showing Puget Sound Shoreline
11-3	View of Maury Island from across Puget Sound
11-4	View Taken from Upper Sandy Shores (Eggert Residence) Looking Northeast
11-5	View of the Project Site Taken from Lower Sandy Shores Looking Northeast
11-6	View of the Project Site Looking Southwest from Gold Beach Drive, Lower Gold Beach
11-7	View of the Project Site from Gold Beach Community Club Looking Southwest
11-8	Potential Enlarged Site Buffer Areas

This page left blank intentionally.